UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,449	04/14/2004	Kendall G. Young	TA-00657	6602

7590 09/23/2009

James E. Bradley
Bracewell & Giuliani LLP
P.O. Box 61389
Houston, TX 77208-1389

EXAMINER	
TIMBLIN, ROBERT M	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/23/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/824,449	YOUNG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ROBERT TIMBLIN	2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 August 2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,8,10-13,15-23,25-27,29-34,36-40,42 and 43* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,8,10-13,15-23,25-27,29-34,36-40,42 and 43* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action corresponds to application 10/824,449 which was filed 4/14/2004.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 8/7/2009 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

In the response filed 8/7/2009, Applicant therein amends claims 1-5, 8, 10-13, 15-23, 25-27, 29-34, 36-40 and 42-43 and cancels claim 35. Accordingly, claims 1-5, 8, 10-13, 15-23, 25-27, 29-34, 36-40 and 42-43 are pending with the response.

Specification

As paragraph 0035 has been presently amended to overcome the prior objection, the objection has therefore been withdrawn.

Claim Objections

Previous claim objections have been withdrawn in light of Applicant's correcting amendments. However, further objections to the amended claims are indicated below:

Claims 1, 2, 8, 10, 12, 15, 17, 20, 22, 23, 25, 29, 31, 33, 36, 37, 38, 39, and 40 are objected to because they use language such as "therebetween", "thereof", "therein", or "thereby". Examiner respectfully requests applicant to remove and/or rephrase said language as to obviate unclarity to what the terms refer to.

Claim 30 is objected to because "perform" in the phrase "...previously retrieved pertinent inputs retrieved responsive to a first keyword search *perform* during the first time period" should be "performed".

Claim 34 is objected to because the second limitation under the preamble begins with "of plurality of". It is herein interpreted that the limitation is rather to begin with "a plurality of".

Correction of the objected claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 8, 11-13, 15-21, 29-31, 33, 34, 36, 38, 39, 42, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodwin et al. ('Goodwin' hereafter, U.S. Patent 7,209,906 B2) in view of Pakhomov (U.S. Patent 7,028,038).

With respect to claim 1, Goodwin teaches A method for maintaining a dynamic reference repository for an enterprise, comprising the steps of:

performing by a processing module (col. 3 line 49; e.g. a service that processes), an automated identification of a plurality of enterprise information requirements (col. 4 line 9-13; e.g. providing a training set that is information that an organization would like to see) based on a desired plurality of enterprise capabilities (col. 2 line 56-59 and col. 4 line 12-13; e.g. Goodwin teaches an organization's desire to be capable to leverage information and expertise to improve organizational responsiveness, innovation, competency and efficiency as well as a desire to provide information) to thereby identify and populate the dynamic reference repository (102; e.g. Discovery Server) with pertinent inputs (col. 2 line 65, col. 3, lines 48-56; e.g. information captured in a spidering process of data repositories) required to support (col. 3 line 40; e.g. content that meets the need of the organization) the plurality of desired enterprise capabilities (col. 2 line 56-59 and col. 4 line 12-13; e.g. an organization's desire to support information needs);

discovering (col. 3 line 48-50; e.g. using discovery services) the pertinent inputs (col. 2 line 65, col. 3, lines 48-56; e.g. information captured in a spidering process of data repositories) to the dynamic reference repository (102) the pertinent inputs (col. 2 line 65, col. 3, lines 48-56; e.g. information captured in a spidering process of data repositories) including updates to a plurality of existing different information resources (fig. 1, references 110-116) previously employed (col. 4 lines 54-55 and col. 5 line 51; e.g. Goodwin teaches processing new documents and therefore the information sources 110-116 previously employed (i.e. the sources are continuously utilized)) to populate the dynamic reference repository (102), the plurality of

existing different information resources (110-116) containing knowledge (col. 1, line 62; Goodwin refers to knowledge sources) accessible to update or add to (col. 3 line 4-5 wherein at least the knowledge map 104 is updated and col. 4 line 65 wherein data is added to the system) the collective knowledge stored within (104-108) the dynamic reference repository (102), at least two of the existing different information resources (110-116);

retrieving the pertinent inputs to the dynamic reference repository (fig. 1) to update or add (col. 3 line 4-5 wherein at least the knowledge map 104 is updated and col. 4 line 65 wherein data is added to the system) to the collective knowledge (104-108) stored in the dynamic reference repository (102); contextually mapping (104; e.g. construction of a knowledge map) to they dynamic reference repository (102);

at least the discovering (col. 3 line 48), retrieving (col. 3 line 49), and mapping (col. 3 line 4) performed with an automated software agent (col. 3 line 55; e.g. a spider) configured to communicate (fig. 1 reference 122 showing a network for communication) with the plurality of information resources (110-116) and a dynamic reference repository database (102) for storing collective knowledge (104-108), the automated software agent stored in a memory device (claim 10; e.g. a medium) accessible to the processing module(col. 3 line 49; e.g. a service that processes).

distributing the pertinent inputs (fig. 1) to update the dynamic reference repository (102).

Goodwin does not appear to teach identification of a plurality of enterprise technology requirements.

Pakhomov, however, teaches identification of a plurality of enterprise technology requirements (col. 4 lines 40-49; e.g. cardiology, rheumatology and endocrinology) for including information relating to a certain context.

Although Goodwin teaches two existing different information resources (110-110), Goodwin does not appear to teach two existing different information resources containing a same term having disparate meanings therebetween and further does not teach contextually mapping the same term found within the pertinent inputs the dynamic reference repository, to include contextually relating use of the same term within each associated different information resource containing the same term to allow the term to be differentiated and properly used; and

differentiating the same term between the at least two different information resources.

Pakhomov, however, teaches two existing different information resources (col. 4 line 11-12; e.g. clinical notes or health records) containing a same term having disparate meanings therebetween (col. 2 line 24-26; e.g. the term "RA" referring to right atrial or rheumatoid arthritis) and further contextually mapping the same term (col. 2 line 26; e.g. "RA") found within the pertinent inputs (col. 2 lines 26-27; e.g. clinical notes) the dynamic reference repository, to include contextually relating use (col. 2 lines 25-27; e.g. whether RA is to be used as right atrial or rheumatoid arthritis) of the same term (col. 2 line 26; e.g. "RA") within each associated different information resource (col. 2 lines 26-27; e.g. clinical notes) containing the same term (col. 2 line 26; e.g. "RA") to allow the term to be differentiated and properly used (col. 2 line 40-42);

differentiating the same term between the at least two different information resources (col. 2 line 25-27 and lines 38-40 wherein the terms are distinguished between notes and reports (i.e. information sources) to differentiate terms.

Accordingly, in the same field of endeavor, (i.e. generating training data and searching information sources), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because the teachings of Pakhomov would have given Goodwin's system required technologies and informational focus in the context of an organization for the benefit of supporting that organization with leverage and expertise to improve overall innovation, competency, and efficiency (e.g. a need disclosed by Goodwin at col. 2 line 56-59). Furthermore, the contextual mapping and term differentiation as taught by Pakhomov would have given Goodwin quality terms to include in a taxonomy (as needed by Goodwin, col. 4 line13).

With respect to claim 2 the Goodwin further teaches, the method of claim 1,

wherein the step of discovering pertinent inputs includes determining the pertinent inputs in a context of the desired capability (col. 4 line 9-10 wherein the training set specifies the data to retrieve for the organization);

wherein the automated software agent is customizable by a user to define a customizable software agent (col. 5 line 11-19; i.e. the process can be edited); and

wherein the method further comprises the customizable software agent (col. 3 line 55; e.g. spider):

mapping an enterprise technical requirement (col. 6 line 10; e.g. a threshold for affinities) received from a procuring entity (col. 5 line 15-16; e.g. taxonomist or col. 6 line 10; e.g. an administrator) and a plurality of pertinent technologies providing different technical solutions to the desired capability (col. 4 lines 14-27; e.g. the system locates a person with expertise (e.g. solutions to the organization's desired affinities)) to allow users to evaluate the plurality of different technical solutions to the received enterprise technical requirement (col. 5 line 34-37; where the users can approve or reject proposals);

searching a plurality of information resources to thereby discover the pertinent inputs to the dynamic reference repository (col. 3 line 55-56; e.g. spidering resources),

cataloging the pertinent inputs (reference 108; e.g. creating an index) to the dynamic reference repository (102), and maintaining the pertinent inputs (col. 3 line 11) to the dynamic reference repository (102).

With respect to claim 3, Goodwin teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of:

dynamically updating identified enterprise requirements provided by a procuring entity (col. 5 line 15-16; e.g. taxonomist or col. 6 line 10; e.g. an administrator) responsive to receiving updates to one or more of the following: operational requirements, system requirements, technical requirements, and standards requirements (col. 6 line 11 wherein setting a threshold for affinities describes a standards requirement);

dynamically updating identified enterprise subject matter expert expertise (col. 5 lines 52-56) for the enterprise responsive to receiving updates to one or more of the following: enterprise

subject. matter expert operational experience, systems experience, and technical experience (col. 6 line 29-34; e.g. subject expertise); and

dynamically updating a knowledge map (104) between enterprise requirements, enterprise technology, updated subject matter expert expertise, and enterprise capabilities responsive to the updated identified enterprise requirements, updated identified enterprise technologies, and updated identified enterprise subject matter expert expertise (col. 5 line 60-col. 6 line 2; e.g. a knowledge map is created for the organization).

Pakhomov further teaches dynamically updating identified enterprise technologies responsive to receiving updates to one or more of the following: basic science, technological theory, technological solutions, and technological sources (col. 3 line 62-63; e.g. a health record database) as a technological source.

With respect to claim 4, Goodwin teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of discovering pertinent inputs to the dynamic reference repository includes identifying updates made the plurality of information resources (110-108) previously employed to populate the dynamic reference repository (102);

wherein the step of distributing the pertinent inputs includes updating the database within the dynamic reference repository (fig. 1); and

wherein the method further comprises: providing notice of the identified updates made to the existing information resources to users of the dynamic reference repository (col. 4 line 66; wherein a user may search the system and new updates can be identified (e.g. notice) by the user), and analyzing and drawing logical linkages (reference 104; e.g. Goodwin creates a

knowledge map to teach such logical linkages) between stored repository documents (102), capability assessments directed to the enterprise (col. 6 line 10) and enterprise subject matter expert inputs (col. 6 line 28 and reference 106).

With respect to claim 8, Goodwin teaches the method of claim 1,

wherein pertinent inputs are contained in, and retrieved by the automated software agent from communications addressed to the dynamic reference repository for storage within the dynamic reference repository (col. 6 lines 23-28; i.e. the Discovery Server sends an email notification of an affinity, and an end user responds with a confirmation);

wherein the communications addressed to the dynamic reference repository include e-mails (col. 6 line 23-28; e.g. the end user's response to an email is correspondingly seen as an email to the system) containing a subject matter expert assessment (col. 6 line 28-29) of the desired enterprise capability to identify and refine one or more procurement entity provided requirements (col. 6 lie 10-11; e.g. a threshold for an affinity requirement) or enterprise technology addressed to the dynamic reference repository; and

wherein the automated software agent includes a utility to perform the step of generating a subject matter expert request for information required to produce the determined pertinent inputs to thereby obtain the required pertinent inputs required to satisfy the desired capability (col. 6 lines 17-34; e.g. the Discovery Server sends requests to users to thereby receive confirmations which further provide the system with expertise).

With respect to claim 11, Goodwin and Pakhomov teach all the elements of claim 1. Pakhomov further teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of:

the automated software agent performing an automated recognition of global replacement (col. 5 line 35; e.g. abbreviation of the term teaches a replacement) of a first name (col. 5 lines 32-35; e.g. "rheumatoid arthritis" as the first term) of a data item (col. 5 line 33; e.g. term) in one of the plurality of information resources (col. 2 lines 26-27; e.g. clinical notes) with that of a second name (col. 5 lines 32-35; e.g. the abbreviation of "rheumatoid arthritis" as "RA" (RA as the second name)) responsive to contextual usage (col. 5 line 35; e.g. surrounding use of this term is similar to the context surrounding the abbreviation "RA") of the second name in the one of the plurality of information resources (col. 4 lines 9-10; e.g. clinical notes or other health records); and

redefining the first name of the data item to that of the second name responsive to the automated recognition of the global replacement of the first name of the data item in the respective information resource (col. 5 lines 30-39; e.g. the name "rheumatoid arthritis" redefined as "RA"), to retrieve pertinent articles, knowledge, or pieces of information containing the data item previously referred to by the first name in the respective information resource (col. 1 line 60-62; e.g. retrieving documents that contain "RA" in the sense of "rheumatoid arthritis").

With respect to claim 12, Goodwin teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of discovering the pertinent inputs further comprises running periodic prioritized customizable agent searches (col. 3 lines 4-5 and 47) prioritized to specific reference materials (col. 3 lines 59-

63 wherein types of spiders are directed towards (i.e. "prioritized") types of repositories and col. 4 line 8-10; e.g. special subset of data repositories represent a prioritization); and

wherein the step of discovering the pertinent inputs further comprises automated time stamping of the discovered pertinent inputs with current time prior to dissemination of notice thereof to users of the database (col. 7 line 18; e.g. a time stamp on a document).

With respect to claim 13, Goodwin teaches the method of claim 12,

wherein the customizable agent searches are neutral to document format (col. 3 lines 55-60; wherein the spidering process may search various sources of different types);

wherein the pertinent inputs further comprise documents required to satisfy the desired capability from the plurality of information resources (110-116) and in a plurality of different document formats (col. 3 lines 55-60) the plurality, of different document formats comprising electronic forms that further comprise MS Office (col. 3 line 60-64), web document (col. 3 line 67), and e-mail document compatible forms (col. 3 line 7 and 59-62);

wherein the customizable agent identifies the documents required to satisfy the desired capability for retrieval (col. 3 lines 4-6);

wherein the customizable agent integrates the retrieved documents having the plurality of different document formats into a common standard format used within an enterprise architecture system (col. 3 line 65-67; e.g. the data is converted to XML).

With respect to claim 15, Goodwin and Pakhomov teach all the elements of claim 1. Pakhomov further teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the same term comprises an acronym

(col. 5 line 35; e.g. "RA" is an acronym for "rheumatoid arthritis") for a first word phrase (col. 5 line 35; e.g. "rheumatoid arthritis") in one of the at least two different information resources (col. 4 line 11-12; e.g. clinical notes or health records) and an acronym (col. 2 line 25-26; e.g. "RA" is an acronym for "right atrial") for a second word phrase (col. 2 line 25-26; e.g. " "right atrial") in another one of the at least two different information resources (col. 2 line 25; e.g. cardiology report), the second word phrase being unrelated to the first word phrase (col. 2 line 24; e.g. each word phrase is directed towards differing medical specialties); and

wherein the method further comprises the step of interpreting the meaning of the same term differently (col.2 line 25-27) for each of the at least two different information sources resources (col. 4 line 11-12; e.g. clinical notes or health records) to differentiate each meaning of the term (col. 2 line 40-42) relative to the respective information resource source (col. 2 lines 25-27), to thereby prevent returning non-pertinent inputs to a search query including the term (col. 1 line 62-65).

With respect to claim 16, Goodwin and Pakhomov teach all the elements of claim 1. Pakhomov further teaches, the method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of:

the automated software agent performing an automated recognition of a global replacement of a name of a data item (col. 5 line 35; e.g. abbreviation of the term teaches a replacement) in one of the plurality of information resources (col. 2 lines 26-27; e.g. clinical notes) from a first name during an earlier first time period (col. 5 line 35; e.g. referring to "rheumatoid arthritis" a first time is a "first period") to a second name during a later second time period (col. 5 line 35; e.g. referring to "RA" a second time is a "second time period") responsive

to contextual usage of the second name in the one of the plurality of information resources during the second time period (col. 5 lines 34-35; e.g. it is likely that the context surrounding the use of this term is similar to the context surrounding the abbreviation "RA"); and

retrieving a set of same articles, knowledge, or pieces of information responsive to a plurality of searches by the automated software agent, each based on a separate one of a corresponding plurality of different keyword names referring to a same data item (col. 1 line 59-62).

With respect to claim 17, Goodwin teaches A dynamic reference repository system for maintaining a dynamic reference repository for an enterprise, the system comprising:

at least one database (fig. 1 reference 102 containing databases 104-108);

a plurality of different information resources (110-116) operably coupled (network 122) to the dynamic reference repository (102); and

a processing module (col. 3 line 49; e.g. a service that processes) operably coupled to the at least one database (fig. 1 reference 102 containing databases 104-108) and operable to execute a set of instructions that when executed cause the processing module to perform the following operations:

identify enterprise information requirements (col. 4 line 9-13; e.g. providing a training set that is information that an organization would like to see) and enterprise technology requirements based on a desired enterprise capability (col. 2 line 56-59 and col. 4 line 12-13; e.g. Goodwin teaches an organization's desire to be capable to leverage information and expertise to improve organizational responsiveness, innovation, competency and efficiency as well as a

desire to provide information) to thereby identify and populate the dynamic reference repository (102; e.g. Discovery Server) with pertinent inputs (col. 2 line 65, col. 3, lines 48-56; e.g. information captured in a spidering process of data repositories) required to support (col. 3 line 40; e.g. content that meets the need of the organization) the desired enterprise capability (col. 2 line 56-59 and col. 4 line 12-13; e.g. an organization's desire to support information needs),

identify the pertinent inputs (col. 2 line 65, col. 3, lines 48-56; e.g. information captured in a spidering process of data repositories) to the dynamic reference repository within the plurality of different information resources (110-116), the pertinent inputs comprising data from the plurality of different information resource resources (col. 2 line 65, col. 3, lines 48-56; e.g. information captured in a spidering process of data repositories) containing knowledge (col. 1, line 62; Goodwin refers to knowledge sources) accessible to update or add to (col. 3 line 4-5 wherein at least the knowledge map 104 is updated and col. 4 line 65 wherein data is added to the system) collective knowledge (104-108) stored within the dynamic reference repository (102) at least two of the different information resources (110-116),

retrieve the pertinent inputs to the dynamic reference repository from the plurality of information resources to update or add to (col. 3 line 4-5 wherein at least the knowledge map 104 is updated and col. 4 line 65 wherein data is added to the system) the collective knowledge (104-108) stored in the dynamic reference repository (102),

manage the pertinent inputs to the dynamic reference repository to include dynamically updating a knowledge map (104) between procurement entity provided enterprise requirements provided by a procurement entity (col. 5 line 15-16; e.g. taxonomist or col. 6 line 10; e.g. an administrator), enterprise technology, subject matter expert inputs (106), and the desired

enterprise capability responsive to one or more of the following: updated identified enterprise requirements (col. 6 line 11 wherein setting a threshold for affinities describes updating a requirement), updated identified enterprise technologies, and updated identified enterprise subject matter expert inputs (col. 5 line 60-col. 6 line 2; e.g. a knowledge map is created for the organization), and

distribute the pertinent inputs (fig. 1) to update the dynamic reference repository (102).

Although Goodwin teaches two existing different information resources (110-110), Goodwin does not appear to teach two existing different information resources containing a same term having disparate meanings therebetween and further does not teach contextually map the same term found within the pertinent inputs required to support the desired enterprise capability, from the plurality of different information resources to the dynamic reference repository, to include the following: contextually relate use of the same term within each of the at least two different information resources containing the same term to allow the term to be differentiated and properly used.

Pakhomov, however, contextually mapping the same term (col. 2 line 26; e.g. "RA") found within the pertinent inputs (col. 2 lines 26-27; e.g. clinical notes) the dynamic reference repository, to include contextually relating use (col. 2 lines 25-27; e.g. whether RA is to be used as right atrial or rheumatoid arthritis) of the same term (col. 2 line 26; e.g. "RA") within each associated different information resource (col. 2 lines 26-27; e.g. clinical notes) containing the same term (col. 2 line 26; e.g. "RA") to allow the term to be differentiated and properly used (col. 2 line 40-42);

Accordingly, in the same field of endeavor, (i.e. generating training data and searching information sources), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because the teachings of Pakhomov would have given Goodwin's system required technologies and informational focus in the context of an organization for the benefit of supporting that organization with leverage and expertise to improve overall innovation, competency, and efficiency (e.g. a need disclosed at col. 2 line 56-59). Furthermore, the contextual mapping and term differentiation as taught by Pakhomov would have given Goodwin quality terms to include in a taxonomy (as needed by Goodwin, col. 4 line 13).

With respect to claim 18, Goodwin teaches the dynamic reference repository system of claim 17,

wherein the instructions to identify pertinent inputs (col. 2 line 65, col. 3, lines 48-56; e.g. information captured in a spidering process of data repositories) to the dynamic reference repository (102) includes those to determine the pertinent inputs in a context of the a specified desired capability (col. 4 line 9-10 wherein the training set specifies the data to retrieve for the organization);

wherein the instructions to dynamically update a knowledge map (108) include those to:

catalog (108) the pertinent inputs to the dynamic reference repository (102), and map an enterprise technical requirement (col. 6 line 10; e.g. a threshold for affinities) received from a procuring entity (col. 5 line 15-16; e.g. taxonomist or col. 6 line 10; e.g. an administrator) and a plurality of pertinent technologies providing different technical solutions to the desired capability

(col. 4 lines 14-27; e.g. the system locates a person with expertise (e.g. solutions to the organization's desired affinities)) to allow users to evaluate the a plurality of different technical solutions to the received enterprise technical requirement (col. 5 line 34-37; where the users can approve or reject proposals); and

wherein the system further comprises at least one customizable agent configured to search and retrieve the pertinent inputs to the dynamic reference repository from the plurality of information resources (col. 3 line 55-56; e.g. spidering resources) and to contextually map the pertinent inputs to the dynamic reference repository to the desired capability (col. 4 lines 35-37 wherein the system discloses a database structure to support inputs that are directed to a capability; e.g. if the capability is to provide skills information, Goodwin's system teaches gathered inputs such as skills would be mapped to this context).

With respect to claim 19, Goodwin teaches the dynamic reference repository of claim 17, wherein the pertinent inputs to the dynamic reference repository (102) include updates made to the plurality of resources (110-116) utilized by the processing module (col. 3 line 49; e.g. a service that processes) as a plurality of prior existing sources of information (col. 4 lines 54-55 and col. 5 line 51; e.g. Goodwin teaches processing new documents and therefore the information sources 110-116 previously employed (i.e. the sources are continuously utilized) for the dynamic reference repository (1020, and wherein the processing module is further operable to:

dynamically update identified enterprise requirements provided by a procuring entity (col. 5 line 15-16; e.g. taxonomist or col. 6 line 10; e.g. an administrator) responsive to receiving updates to one or more of the following:

operational requirements, system requirements, technical requirements, and standards requirements (col. 6 line 11 wherein setting a threshold for affinities describes a standards requirement);

dynamically updating identified enterprise subject matter expert expertise for the enterprise responsive to receiving updates to one or more of the following: enterprise subject matter expert operational experience, systems experience, and technical experience (col. 5 line 60-col. 6 line 2; e.g. a knowledge map is created for the organization).

Pakhomov further teaches dynamically updating identified enterprise technologies responsive to receiving updates to one or more of the following: basic science, technological theory, technological solutions, and technological sources (col. 3 line 62-63; e.g. a health record database) as a technological source.

With respect to claim 20, Goodwin teaches the dynamic reference repository of claim 17,

wherein the instructions to identify pertinent inputs to the dynamic reference repository (102) include those to identify updates made to the plurality of information resources being previously employed (110-116) by the processing module to populate the dynamic reference repository (102) to define a plurality of existing information resources;

wherein the instructions to identify pertinent inputs to the dynamic reference repository include those to update the database within the dynamic reference repository (col. 4 line 65); and

wherein the processing module is further operable to provide notice of the identified updates made to the plurality of existing information resources to users of the dynamic reference repository (col. 4 line 66 and col. 5 line 9-10; wherein retrieved information from a search would provide notice of updates (i.e. new information is given to the user), and analyze and draw logical linkages (reference 104; e.g. Goodwin creates a knowledge map to teach such logical linkages) between updated repository documents (102), capability assessments directed to the enterprise (col. 6 line 10), and enterprise subject matter expert inputs stored therein (col. 6 line 28 and reference 106).

With respect to claim 21, Goodwin teaches the dynamic reference repository system of claim 17,

wherein the plurality of information resources comprise one or more of the following: Internet (110), intranet (col. 5 line 7), and or-subject matter experts (SMEs) resources (116);

wherein the processing module is further operable to discover the pertinent inputs by executing a periodic prioritized search (col. 3 lines 4-5 and 47) of reference materials within the at least one plurality of information resources prioritized to specific user-selected reference materials (col. 3 lines 59-63 wherein types of spiders are directed towards (i.e. "prioritized") types of repositories and col. 4 line 8-10; e.g. special subset of data repositories represent a prioritization); and

wherein the processing module is further operable to time stamp the pertinent inputs with current time prior to dissemination of notice to users of the at least one database (col. 7 line 18; e.g. a time stamp on a document).

With respect to claim 29, Goodwin and Pakhomov teach all the elements of claim 17. Pakhomov further teaches the dynamic reference repository system of claim 17, the processing module is further operable to:

interpret the meaning of the term differently for the at least two different information resources (col. 2 lines 25-27) to differentiate each disparate meaning of the term relative to the respective associated different information resource (col. 4 lines 11-12; e.g. clinical notes or health records) to thereby prevent returning non-pertinent inputs to a search query including the term (col. 1 line 60-67).

With respect to claim 30, Goodwin and Pakhomov teach all the elements of claim 17. Pakhomov further teaches the dynamic reference repository system of claim 17, further comprising at least one customizable software agent configured to:

recognize a global replacement of a name of a data item (col. 5 line 35; e.g. abbreviation of the term teaches a replacement) in one of the plurality of information resources (col. 2 lines 26-27; e.g. clinical notes) from a first name during an earlier first time period (col. 5 line 35; e.g. referring to "rheumatoid arthritis" a first time is a "first period") to a second name during a later second time period (col. 5 line 35; e.g. referring to "RA" a second time is a "second time period") responsive to contextual usage of the second name in the one of the plurality of information resources during the second time period (col. 5 lines 34-35; e.g. it is likely that the context surrounding the use of this term is similar to the context surrounding the abbreviation "RA"); and

retrieving a second set of articles, knowledge, or pieces of information defining a second set of returned pertinent inputs returned from the one of the plurality of information resources responsive to a second keyword search (col. 1 line 61; e.g. retrieving information from documents that use "RA") by the at least one customizable software agent performed during the second time period (e.g. a time wherein "RA" is searched" the second set of returned pertinent inputs related to a similar first set of previously, retrieved pertinent inputs retrieved responsive to a first keyword search perform during the first time period (e.g. a time wherein "rheumatoid arthritis" is searched), the first keyword ("rheumatoid arthritis") search and the second keyword search both including the first name as a keyword and not the second name as a keyword ("rheumatoid arthritis"), at least one of the second set of returned pertinent inputs including the second name used therein to refer to the data item and not the first name to refer to the data item (col. 1 line 60-65 wherein the system is able to retrieve inputs whether "RA" is searched or "rheumatoid arthritis").

With respect to claim 31, Goodwin teaches A method for populating a dynamic reference repository for an enterprise, comprising:

performing by a processing module (col. 3 line 49; e.g. a service that processes), an automated identification of a plurality of enterprise information requirements (col. 4 line 9-13; e.g. providing a training set that is information that an organization would like to see) based on a desired plurality of enterprise capabilities (col. 2 line 56-59 and col. 4 line 12-13; e.g. Goodwin teaches an organization's desire to be capable to leverage information and expertise to improve organizational responsiveness, innovation, competency and efficiency as well as a desire to

provide information) to thereby identify and populate the dynamic reference repository (102; e.g. Discovery Server) with pertinent inputs (col. 2 line 65, col. 3, lines 48-56; e.g. information captured in a spidering process of data repositories) required to support (col. 3 line 40; e.g. content that meets the need of the organization) the plurality of desired enterprise capabilities (col. 2 line 56-59 and col. 4 line 12-13; e.g. an organization's desire to support information needs);

discovering (col. 3 line 48-50; e.g. using discovery services) the pertinent inputs (col. 2 line 65, col. 3, lines 48-56; e.g. information captured in a spidering process of data repositories) to the dynamic reference repository (102) the pertinent inputs (col. 2 line 65, col. 3, lines 48-56; e.g. information captured in a spidering process of data repositories) including updates to a plurality of existing different information resources (fig. 1, references 110-116) previously employed (col. 4 lines 54-55 and col. 5 line 51; e.g. Goodwin teaches processing new documents and therefore the information sources 110-116 previously employed (i.e. the sources are continuously utilized) to populate the dynamic reference repository (102), the plurality of existing different information resources (110-116) containing knowledge (col. 1, line 62; Goodwin refers to knowledge sources) accessible to update or add to (col. 3 line 4-5 wherein at least the knowledge map 104 is updated and col. 4 line 65 wherein data is added to the system) the collective knowledge stored within (104-108) the dynamic reference repository (102), at least two of the existing different information resources (110-116);

retrieving the pertinent inputs to the dynamic reference repository (fig. 1) to update or add (col. 3 line 4-5 wherein at least the knowledge map 104 is updated and col. 4 line 65 wherein data is added to the system) to the collective knowledge (104-108) stored in the dynamic

reference repository (102); contextually mapping (104; e.g. construction of a knowledge map) to they dynamic reference repository (102);

managing the pertinent inputs to the dynamic reference repository to update or add to the collective knowledge stored in the dynamic reference repository (col. 4 line 65) the managing including:

distributing the pertinent inputs (fig. 1) to update the dynamic reference repository (102); and

at least the discovering (col. 3 line 48), retrieving (col. 3 line 49), and mapping (col. 3 line 4) performed with an automated software agent (col. 3 line 55; e.g. a spider) configured to communicate (fig. 1 reference 122 showing a network for communication) with the plurality of information resources (110-116) and a dynamic reference repository database (102) for storing collective knowledge (104-108), the automated software agent stored in a memory device (claim 10; e.g. a medium) accessible to the processing module(col. 3 line 49; e.g. a service that processes).

Goodwin does not appear to teach two existing different information resources containing a same term having disparate meanings therebetween and further does not teach contextually relating use of the same term within each associated different information resource containing the same term to allow the term to be differentiated and properly used;

differentiating a first meaning behind the term a with respect to an associated first one of the plurality of information resources and a second meaning behind the term with respect to a second one of the plurality of information resources unrelated to the first meaning, to prevent returning non-pertinent inputs to a search query including the term;

Pakhomov, however, teaches contextually relating use (col. 2 lines 25-27; e.g. whether RA is to be used as right atrial or rheumatoid arthritis) of the same term (col. 2 line 26; e.g. "RA") within each associated different information resource (col. 2 lines 26-27; e.g. clinical notes) containing the same term (col. 2 line 26; e.g. "RA") to allow the term to be differentiated and properly used (col. 2 line 40-42);

differentiating a first meaning behind the term (col. 2; e.g. "RA") a with respect to an associated first one of the plurality of information resources (col. 2 line 26) and a second meaning behind the term with respect to a second one of the plurality of information resources unrelated to the first meaning (col. 2 lines 24-27), to prevent returning non-pertinent inputs to a search query including the term (col. 1 lines 50-67) to differentiate terms.

Accordingly, in the same field of endeavor, (i.e. generating training data and searching information sources), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because the teachings of Pakhomov would have given Goodwin's system required technologies and informational focus in the context of an organization for the benefit of supporting that organization with leverage and expertise to improve overall innovation, competency, and efficiency (e.g. a need disclosed at col. 2 line 56-59). Furthermore, the contextual mapping and term differentiation as taught by Pakhomov would have given Goodwin quality terms to include in a taxonomy (as needed by Goodwin, col. 4 line13).

With respect to claim 33, Goodwin teaches the method of claim 31,

wherein the first one of the plurality of information resources is a first electronic communication addressed to the dynamic reference repository (col. 6 lines 23-28; i.e. the Discovery Server sends an email notification of an affinity, and an end user responds with a confirmation);

wherein the second one of the plurality of information resources is a second electronic communication addressed to the dynamic reference repository (col. 6 lines 23-28; i.e. the Discovery Server sends an email notification of an affinity, and (another) end user responds with a confirmation);

wherein the pertinent inputs are contained in and retrieved by the customizable software agent from the first and the second electronic communications addressed to the dynamic reference repository (col. 6 lines 23-28; i.e. the Discovery Server sends an email notification of an affinity, and responses with a confirmation describe a return email).

Pakhomov further teaches

wherein the first and the second meanings are disparate first and second meanings (col. 2 lines 24-27);

wherein the term is an acronym (col. 2 line 26; e.g. "RA") used as a keyword matching a first abbreviation of a word or phrase used within the first electronic communication (col. 2 line 26; e.g. a note) according to the first meaning and matching a second abbreviation of a different word or phrase used in the second electronic communication, according to the second meaning (col.2 line 26 wherein "RA" can instead be "right atrial");

wherein the step of contextually relating use of a term within each of a first and a second one of the plurality of information resources containing the term includes: tagging the acronym and contextually relating the acronym separately with each of the separate associated first and second electronic communications to allow the acronym to be differentiated and properly used (col. 2 lines 24-27; e.g. "RA" is identified as contained in a report or note (source) and thus the identification with the respective source is seen as "tagging") to thereby maintain integrity of each assigned meaning of the acronym, and wherein the method further comprises:

interpreting the meaning of the acronym differently (col. 2 lines 25-27) for the first and the second electronic communications (col. 2 lines 26-26; e.g. notes and reports as sources) to differentiate each meaning of the acronym relative to the respective electronic communication to prevent returning non-pertinent inputs to a search query directed to data associated with only one of the disparate meanings (col. 1 line 62-67).

With respect to claim 34, Goodwin teaches An enterprise architecture including a dynamic reference repository system having a dynamic reference repository, that comprises:

at least one database (fig. 1 reference 102 containing databases 104-108);

a plurality of different information resources (110-116) operably coupled (network 122) to the dynamic reference repository (102); and

a processing module operably coupled to the at least one database and operable to execute a set of instructions to:

identify enterprise information requirements (col. 4 line 9-13; e.g. providing a training set that is information that an organization would like to see) and enterprise technology

requirements based on a desired enterprise capability (col. 2 line 56-59 and col. 4 line 12-13; e.g. Goodwin teaches an organization's desire to be capable to leverage information and expertise to improve organizational responsiveness, innovation, competency and efficiency as well as a desire to provide information) to thereby identify and populate the dynamic reference repository (102; e.g. Discovery Server) with pertinent inputs (col. 2 line 65, col. 3, lines 48-56; e.g. information captured in a spidering process of data repositories) required to support (col. 3 line 40; e.g. content that meets the need of the organization) the desired enterprise capability (col. 2 line 56-59 and col. 4 line 12-13; e.g. an organization's desire to support information needs),

identify the pertinent inputs (col. 2 line 65, col. 3, lines 48-56; e.g. information captured in a spidering process of data repositories) to the dynamic reference repository (102) within the information resource (110-116), the pertinent inputs (col. 2 line 65, col. 3, lines 48-56; e.g. information captured in a spidering process of data repositories) comprising data from the information resource (110-116),

retrieve the pertinent inputs to the dynamic reference repository from the at last one-information resource (fig. 1) to update or add to the collective knowledge stored in the dynamic reference repository (col. 3 line 4-5 wherein at least the knowledge map 104 is updated and col. 4 line 65 wherein data is added to the system).

Goodwin does not appear to expressly teach the identification of pertinent inputs including performing an automated recognition of a global replacement of a first name of a data item in the information resource with a different second name to retrieve pertinent articles, knowledge, or pieces of information containing the data item referred to by the different second

name in the information resource responsive to contextual usage of the different, second name in the information resource,

manage the pertinent inputs to the dynamic reference repository to include: contextually relating use of a term within each of a first and a second one of the plurality of information resources containing, the term to allow the term to be differentiated and properly used, and distribute the pertinent inputs to update the dynamic reference repository.

Pakhomov, however, teaches the identification of pertinent inputs including performing an automated recognition of a global replacement (col. 5 line 35; e.g. abbreviation of the term teaches a replacement) of a first name (col. 5 lines 32-35; e.g. “rheumatoid arthritis” as the first term) of a data item (col. 5 line 33; e.g. term) in the information resource with a different second name (col. 5 lines 32-35; e.g. the abbreviation of “rheumatoid arthritis” as "RA" (RA as the second name)) to retrieve pertinent articles, knowledge, or pieces of information containing the data item referred to by the different second name in the information resource responsive to contextual usage of the different, second name in the information resource (col. 5 line 35; e.g. surrounding use of this term is similar to the context surrounding the abbreviation “RA”),

manage the pertinent inputs to the dynamic reference repository to include: contextually relating use of a term (col. 2 lines 25-27; e.g. whether RA is to be used as right atrial or rheumatoid arthritis) within each of a first and a second one of the plurality of information resources col. 2 lines 26-27; e.g. clinical notes) containing the term to allow the term to be differentiated and properly used, and distribute the pertinent inputs to update the dynamic reference repository (col. 2 line 40-42).

With respect to claim 36, Goodwin teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of discovering pertinent inputs includes iteratively performing an automated search (col. 3 lines 4-5 and 47 as well as use of a knowledge discovery system scheduler 218)) for identifying updates made to the plurality of existing information resources (110-116) for the dynamic reference repository (102) and identification thereof when existing responsive to a present interval (e.g. a discovery schedule 218);

wherein the step of distributing the pertinent inputs includes updating the database within the dynamic reference repository responsive to the automated identification of the updates (col. 3 line 4-5 wherein at least the knowledge map 104 is updated and col. 4 line 65 wherein data is added to the system); and

wherein the method further comprises the step of automatically disseminating a plurality of user tailored notices of the identified updates (col. 4 line 66 wherein a user may search and further, results from a search that yields updated spidered information may be seen as a "tailored notice" (e.g. results specific to a user provided search are user tailored)) to a corresponding plurality of users of the dynamic reference repository responsive to the automated identification of the updates, each user tailored notice individually tailored for each separate one of the plurality of users responsive to a list of keywords provided by the respective user (col. 4 lines 35-37 wherein the a query from a user may be seen to include a list of keywords to refine results) and different from that of each other of the plurality of users to thereby provide selective individual user-based notification (col. 4 line 66; e.g. user tailored results).

With respect to claim 38, Goodwin and Pakhomov teach the elements of claim 17. Pakhomov further teaches the dynamic reference repository system of claim 17, wherein the processing module is further operable to:

tag a term and contextually relate the term with its associated information resource to allow the term to be differentiated and properly used to thereby maintain integrity of an assigned meaning of the terms col. 2 lines 24-27; e.g. “RA” is identified as contained in a report or note (source) and thus the identification with the respective source is seen as “tagging”); and

differentiate a first meaning behind the term with respect to a first associated information resource and a second meaning behind the term with respect to a second information resource (col. 2 line 25-27 and lines 38-40 wherein the terms are distinguished between notes and reports (i.e. information sources) to thereby prevent returning non-pertinent inputs to a search query including the term (col. 1 lines 60-67); and

wherein the processing module is further operable to:

redefine contextually a definition of the term underlying the at least one database responsive to one or more identified pertinent inputs identifying a change in a usage of the term therein (col. 5 lines 30-39; e.g. the name “rheumatoid arthritis” redefined as "RA").

With respect to claim 39, Goodwin teaches the dynamic reference repository system of claim 17,

wherein the instructions to identify pertinent inputs to the dynamic reference repository include those to perform an automated identification updates made to the plurality of information resources (col. 2 line 6 wherein the system is able to identify newly acquired data) being

previously employed (col. 110-116) by the processing module to populate the dynamic reference repository (102) to define a plurality of existing information resources for the dynamic reference repository (102) and identification thereof when existing responsive to a preset interval (e.g. a discovery schedule 218);

wherein instructions to distribute distributing the pertinent inputs includes those to update the at least one database within the dynamic reference repository responsive to the automated identification of the updates (col. 4 line 65); and

wherein the processing module is further operable to automatically disseminate a plurality of user tailored notices of the identified updates (col. 4 line 66 wherein a user may search and further, results from a search that yields updated spidered information may be seen as a "tailored notice" (e.g. results specific to a user provided search are user tailored)) to a corresponding plurality of users of the dynamic reference repository responsive to the automated identification of the updates, each user tailored notice individually tailored for each separate one of the plurality of users responsive to a list of keywords provided by the respective user (col. 4 lines 35-37 wherein the a query from a user may be seen to include a list of keywords to refine results) and different from that of each other of the plurality of users to thereby provide selective individual user-based notification (col. 4 line 66; e.g. user tailored results).

With respect to claim 42, Goodwin teaches the enterprise architecture as defined in claim 34, wherein the processing module is further operable to retrieve the pertinent articles, knowledge, or pieces of information (fig. 1 wherein Goodwin retrieves information from various data sources).

Pakhomov further teaches [pertinent inputs] containing the data item referred to by the different second name in information resource and not the first name responsive to a keyword search criteria including the first name and not the second name (col. 1 line 60-62; e.g. retrieving documents that contain "RA" in the sense of "rheumatoid arthritis").

With respect to claim 43, Goodwin and Pakhomov teach the elements of claim 34. Pakhomov further teaches the enterprise architecture as defined in claim 34,

wherein the enterprise architecture includes at least two different information sources of the plurality of information sources (col. 4 line 11-12; e.g. clinical notes or health records) containing a same term having disparate meanings therebetween (col. 2 line 24-26; e.g. the term "RA" referring to right atrial or rheumatoid arthritis) and further differentiating the same term between the at least two different information resources (col. 2 line 25-27 and lines 38-40 wherein the terms are distinguished between notes and reports (i.e. information sources) to differentiate terms

facilitate proper use the same term .by a user of the dynamic reference repository, and maintain integrity of each separate assigned meaning to the same term (col. 2 line 40-42).

Claims 5, 22, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodwin and Pakhomov as applied to parent claims 1, 17, and 31 respectively above and further in view of Barney et al. ('Barney' hereafter; U.S. Patent 6,070,143).

With respect to claim 5, Goodwin teaches the method of claim 2, wherein the customizable agent searches, discovers, and retrieves the pertinent inputs from Internet and intranet resources (fig. 1);

wherein the customizable agent searches (col. 3 line 55), discovers, and retrieves the pertinent inputs from subject matter experts (SMEs) for the enterprise (reference 116; e.g. a people directory source).

Goodwin and Pakhomov do not appear to expressly teach wherein the customizable agent further comprises at least one utility configured to initiate contact with a SME with an online communication and to conduct a SME review or assessment of a technology or capability, the online communication including a link to an interactive enterprise website associated with the dynamic reference repository to conduct the SME reviews review or assessment.

Barney, however, teaches wherein the customizable agent further comprises at least one utility configured to initiate contact with a SME (col. 6 line 26) with an online communication (col. 6 line 27) and to conduct a SME review or assessment of a technology or capability (col. 6 line 27; e.g. a survey), the online communication including a link to an interactive enterprise website (col. 6 line 31) associated with the dynamic reference repository to conduct the SME reviews review or assessment (col. 6 line 27) for providing a subject matter expert with a link to a survey to gain input therefrom.

In the same field of endeavor, (i.e. information management), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because teachings of Barney would have given the combination of Goodwin and Pakhomov subject matter expertise and people profile data (e.g.

needed by Goodwin, reference 106) for the benefit of providing expertise that would give an organization improved innovation competency an deficiency (desired by Goodwin, col. 2 line 58-59).

With respect to claim 22, Goodwin teaches the dynamic reference repository system of claim 17, further comprising:

at least one customizable agent configured to search and retrieve the pertinent inputs to the dynamic reference repository from the plurality of information resources (col. 3 lines 41-44), an interface configured to provide a single common user entry point (col. 3 line 40) into the at least one database (102) for a plurality of physically spaced apart users (118, 120) connected through a corresponding plurality of different networks (122), and configured to allow each of the plurality of users to create, edit (118), and manage (col. 6 line 10-12) the at least one customizable agent (col. 3 line 55; e.g. a spider) to create, populate, and maintain (col. 3 line 50) contextual information extracted from the plurality of information resources (110-116) to thereby provide shared knowledge throughout an enterprise (fig. 1 and col. 4 line 35-37).

Goodwin and Pakhomov do not appear to teach at least one utility configured to initiate contact with a subject matter expert (SME) with an online communication and to conduct an interactive SME review or assessment of a procurement entity provided enterprise requirement, enterprise technology or enterprise capability, the online communication including a link to an interactive enterprise website associated with the dynamic reference repository to conduct the SME review or assessment

Barney, however, teaches wherein the customizable agent further comprises at least one utility configured to initiate contact with a SME (col. 6 line 26) with an online communication (col. 6 line 27) and to conduct a SME review or assessment of a technology or capability (col. 6 line 27; e.g. a survey), the online communication including a link to an interactive enterprise website (col. 6 line 31) associated with the dynamic reference repository to conduct the SME reviews review or assessment (col. 6 line 27) for providing a subject matter expert with a link to a survey to gain input therefrom.

In the same field of endeavor, (i.e. information management), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because teachings of Barney would have given the combination of Goodwin and Pakhomov subject matter expertise and people profile data (e.g. needed by Goodwin, reference 106) for the benefit of providing expertise that would give an organization improved innovation competency an deficiency (desired by Goodwin, col. 2 line 58-59).

With respect to claim 32, Goodwin teaches the method of claim 31, wherein the customizable software agent further searches for, discovers, and retrieves the pertinent inputs from subject matter experts (SMEs);

wherein the customizable agent searches (col. 3 line 55), discovers, and retrieves the pertinent inputs from subject matter experts (SMEs) for the enterprise (reference 116; e.g. a people directory source)

Goodwin and Pakhomov do not appear to expressly teach wherein the customizable agent further comprises at least one utility configured to initiate contact with a SME with an online communication and to conduct a SME review or assessment of a technology or capability, the online communication including a link to an interactive enterprise website associated with the dynamic reference repository to conduct the SME reviews review or assessment.

Barney, however, teaches wherein the customizable agent further comprises at least one utility configured to initiate contact with a SME (col. 6 line 26) with an online communication (col. 6 line 27) and to conduct a SME review or assessment of a technology or capability (col. 6 line 27; e.g. a survey), the online communication including a link to an interactive enterprise website (col. 6 line 31) associated with the dynamic reference repository to conduct the SME reviews review or assessment (col. 6 line 27) for providing a subject matter expert with a link to a survey to gain input therefrom.

In the same field of endeavor, (i.e. information management), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because teachings of Barney would have given the combination of Goodwin and Pakhomov subject matter expertise and people profile data (e.g. needed by Goodwin, reference 106) for the benefit of providing expertise that would give an organization improved innovation competency an deficiency (desired by Goodwin, col. 2 line 58-59).

Claims 10, 37, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodwin and Pakhomov as applied to parent claim 1 and 17, respectively, above and further in view of Kravets et al. ('Kravets' hereafter; U.S. Patent 6,363,377).

With respect to claim 10, Goodwin teaches the method of claim 2, wherein the customizable agent searches are developed using a graphical user interface (GUI) that interfaces (col. 5 line 9) with the dynamic reference repository (col. 4 line 66 wherein Goodwin teaches an end user may search the system);

wherein the GUI allows a particular user to develop, customize, and manage the customizable agent searches (col. 4 line 66 wherein Goodwin teaches an end user may search the system; the creation of a end user search teaches customization of the search); and

Goodwin and Pakhomov do not appear to teach the customizable agent dynamically modifying a custom user search request prior to execution thereof to define a current dynamic agent search responsive to one or more of the following; past agent usage by the particular user, past search habits of the particular user, current search habits of the particular user and characteristics of the particular user to thereby optimize returned search results, the search results including additional information not desired by the particular user to define undesired information and providing automated feedback to the customizable agent responsive to a user refusing the undesired information returned during the current dynamic agent search to thereby update a next dynamic agent search.

Kravets, however, teaches the customizable agent dynamically modifying a custom user search request prior to execution thereof (col. 4 lines 8-10 and figure 1A, references 10-18) to

define a current dynamic agent search (reference 18) responsive to one or more of the following: past agent usage by the particular user, past search habits of the particular user, current search habits of the particular user and characteristics of the particular user to thereby optimize returned search results, the search results including additional information not desired by the particular user to define undesired information (col. 3 lines 62-65; previous search's keywords are added to the search query to teach at least a user's past search habits and/or characteristics of the user) and

providing automated feedback to the customizable agent responsive to a user refusing the undesired information (col. 7 lines 26-33; e.g. the user choosing a (result) cell teaches the refusal of other result information) returned during the current dynamic agent search to thereby update a next dynamic agent search (col. 7 lines 26-33 and figure 5 wherein a next search is updated to search for "Cape May Country") for improving information searching.

Accordingly, in the same field of endeavor, (i.e. information searching), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because the searching technique as provided by Kravets would have given a user of Goodwin and Pakhomov's system refined results with the benefit of efficient searching.

With respect to claim 37, Goodwin and Pakhomov do not teach the method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of:

dynamically modifying a current search for a user searching the dynamic reference repository, prior to execution thereof responsive to search habits of the user to thereby optimize

search results for the user, the search results of the current search including additional information not desired by the particular user to define undesired information; and

dynamically updating a next search responsive to user input rejecting the undesired information gathered during the current search to optimize search results for the user.

Kravets, however, teaches dynamically modifying a current search for a user searching the dynamic reference repository, prior to execution thereof responsive to search habits of the user (col. 3 lines 62-65; previous search's keywords are added to the search query to teach at least a user's past search habits and/or characteristics of the user) to thereby optimize search results for the user, the search results of the current search including additional information not desired by the particular user to define undesired information; and

dynamically updating a next search (col. 7 lines 26-33 and figure 5 wherein a next search is updated to search for "Cape May Country") responsive to user input rejecting the undesired information gathered during the current search (col. 7 lines 26-33; e.g. the user choosing a (result) cell teaches the refusal of other result information) to optimize search results for the user.

Accordingly, in the same field of endeavor, (i.e. information searching), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because the searching technique as provided by Kravets would have given a user of Goodwin and Pakhomov's system refined results with the benefit of efficient searching.

With respect to claim 40, Goodwin and Pakhomov do not teach the dynamic reference repository system of claim 17, wherein the processing module is further operable to:

dynamically modify a current search for a user searching the dynamic reference repository prior to execution thereof responsive to search habits of the user to thereby optimize returned search results for the user, the search results of the current search including additional information not desired by the particular user to define undesired information; and

dynamic update a next search responsive to user input rejecting the undesired information gathered during the current search to optimize search results for the user.

Kravets, however, teaches dynamically modifying a current search for a user searching the dynamic reference repository, prior to execution thereof responsive to search habits of the user (col. 3 lines 62-65; previous search's keywords are added to the search query to teach at least a user's past search habits and/or characteristics of the user) to thereby optimize search results for the user, the search results of the current search including additional information not desired by the particular user to define undesired information; and

dynamically updating a next search (col. 7 lines 26-33 and figure 5 wherein a next search is updated to search for "Cape May Country") responsive to user input rejecting the undesired information gathered during the current search (col. 7 lines 26-33; e.g. the user choosing a (result) cell teaches the refusal of other result information) to optimize search results for the user.

Accordingly, in the same field of endeavor, (i.e. information searching), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because the searching technique as provided by Kravets would have given a user of Goodwin and Pakhomov's system refined results with the benefit of efficient searching.

Claims 23, 25-27 is are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodwin, Pakhomov, and Barney as applied to parent claim 17 above and further in view of Kravets.

With respect to claim 23, Goodwin teaches the dynamic reference repository system of claim 22,

wherein the interface to the at least one database (102) is configured to receive pertinent inputs contained within communications addressed to the dynamic reference repository, and to retrieve the received pertinent inputs to the dynamic reference repository for storage therein (col. 6 lines 23-28; i.e. the Discovery Server sends an email notification of an affinity, and an end user responds with a confirmation).

Goodwin, Pakhomov, and Barney do not teach dynamically modify a custom user search request prior to execution thereof to define a current dynamic agent search responsive to one or more of the following: past agent usage by a particular user, past search habits of the particular user, past search habits of the particular user, current search habits of the particular user, and characteristics of the particular user to thereby optimize returned search results, the search results including additional information not desired by the particular user to define undesired information, and dynamically perform an automated updating of a next customizable agent search for the a particular user responsive to a user input refusing the undesired information returned during a current customizable agent search.

Kravets, however, teaches modify a custom user search request prior to execution thereof(col. 4 lines 8-10 and figure 1A, references 10-18) to define a current dynamic agent

search responsive to one or more of the following: past agent usage by a particular user, past search habits of the particular user, past search habits of the particular user, current search habits of the particular user, and characteristics of the particular information user (col. 3 lines 62-65; previous search's keywords are added to the search query to teach at least a user's past search habits and/or characteristics of the user) to thereby optimize returned search results, the search results including additional information not desired by the particular user (col. 7 lines 26-33; e.g. the user choosing a (result) cell teaches the undesired result information) to define undesired information, and dynamically perform an automated updating of a next customizable agent search for the a particular user responsive to a user input refusing the undesired information returned during a current customizable agent search (col. 7 lines 26-33 and figure 5 wherein a next search is updated to search for "Cape May Country").

Accordingly, in the same field of endeavor, (i.e. information searching), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because the searching technique as provided by Kravets would have given a user of Goodwin, Pakhomov, and Barney's system refined results with the benefit of efficient searching.

With respect to claim 25, Goodwin teaches the dynamic reference repository system of claim 23, wherein the communications addressed to the dynamic reference repository are e-mails (col. 6 lines 23-28; i.e. the Discovery Server sends an email notification of an affinity, and an end user responds with a confirmation; wherein the response to an email can be seen as an email communication) containing subject matter expert assessments of a procurement entity provided

enterprise requirement (col. 6 line 10-15), enterprise technology, or enterprise capability addressed to the dynamic reference repository (col. 5 lines 34-37; e.g. the evaluation of an affinity and approval/rejection thereof teaches the assessment of a requirement); and

wherein the at least one customizable agent includes a utility to generate a subject matter expert request for information required to produce the determined pertinent inputs to thereby obtain the required pertinent inputs required to satisfy the desired capability.

With respect to claim 26, Goodwin and Pakhomov teach the elements of claim 17. Goodwin and Pakhomov further teach the dynamic reference repository system of claim 23, wherein the at least one customizable agent comprises utilities to:

recognize a global replacement of a first name of a data item (col. 5 line 35; e.g. abbreviation of the term teaches a replacement) of a first name (col. 5 lines 32-35; e.g. "rheumatoid arthritis" as the first term) in the plurality of information resources (col. 2 lines 26-27; e.g. clinical notes) responsive to contextual usage (col. 5 line 35; e.g. surrounding use of this term is similar to the context surrounding the abbreviation "RA") of the first name in the plurality of information resources to retrieve pertinent articles, knowledge, or pieces of information containing the data item referred to by a different name in the plurality of information resources (col. 1 line 60-62; e.g. retrieving documents that contain "RA" in the sense of "rheumatoid arthritis"); and

redefine the first name of the data item to that of the second name responsive to the recognition of the global replacement of the first name of the data item in the plurality of information resources (col. 5 lines 30-39; e.g. the name "rheumatoid arthritis" redefined as

"RA") to retrieve pertinent articles, knowledge, or pieces of information containing the data item previously referred to by a different name in the plurality of information resources (col. 1 line 60-62; e.g. retrieving documents that contain "RA" in the sense of "rheumatoid arthritis").

With respect to claim 27, Goodwin further teaches the dynamic reference repository system of claim 22, wherein the at least one customizable agent is neutral to document format;

wherein the pertinent inputs further comprise documents required to satisfy the desired capability from the plurality of information resources and in a plurality of different document formats (col. 3 lines 55-60), the plurality, of different document formats comprising electronic forms that further comprise MS Office (col. 3 line 60-64), web document (col. 3 line 67), and e-mail document compatible forms (col. 3 line 7 and 59-62):

wherein the at least one customizable agent is configured to identify the documents required to satisfy the desired capability for retrieval (col. 3 lines 4-6); and

wherein the at least one customizable agent is configured to integrate the retrieved documents having the plurality of different document formats into a common standard format used within an enterprise architecture system including the dynamic reference repository system (col. 3 line 65-67; e.g. the data is converted to XML).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 8, 10-13, 15-23, 25-27, 29-34, 36-40, and 42-43 have been considered and are persuasive, but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ROBERT TIMBLIN whose telephone number is (571)272-5627. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John R. Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/ROBERT TIMBLIN/

Examiner, Art Unit 2167